UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN SOUTHERN DIVISION

ANN MARIE STINNETT,

Plaintiff,

HONORABLE PAUL D. BORMAN

v.

No. 10-15043

BROOKS KUSHMAN, P.C. AND MARK A. CANTOR,

Defendants.

HEARING ON DEFENDANTS' EMERGENCY MOTION TO STRIKE AND/OR SEAL AMENDED SECOND COMPLAINT

Friday, February 25, 2011

Appearances:

Ann Marie Stinnett David Cessante
The Stinnett Law Group, PLC Clark Hill, P.L.C.
101 W. Big Beaver Road, #1400 500 Woodward Avenue, #3500 Troy, Michigan 48084 (248) 687-1536 On behalf of Plaintiff

Tracy A. Leahy Detroit, Michigan 48226-3435 (313) 965-8300 On behalf of Defendants

To obtain a certified transcript, contact: Sheri K. Ward, Official Court Reporter Theodore Levin United States Courthouse 231 West Lafayette Boulevard, Room 219 Detroit, Michigan 48226 (313)965-4401 · ward@transcriptorders.com

Transcript produced using machine shorthand and CAT software.

Case 2:10-cv-15043-PDB-LJM ECF No. 54, PageID.558 Filed 05/06/11 Page 2 of 28

Motion to Strike and/or Seal Amended Second Complaint Friday, February 25, 2011

INDEX

Motion Hearing	Page
Argument by Ms. Leahy	3
Argument by Ms. Stinnett	12
Argument by Ms. Leahy	22
Certification of Reporter	27

1	Detroit, Michigan
2	Friday, February 25, 2011
3	11:11 a.m.
4	
5	THE CLERK: Stinnett v. Brooks Kushman and
6	Mark Cantor, Case Number 10-15043.
7	THE COURT: Okay. I'll just put out the pleadings
8	here.
9	Okay. Will the party please identify themselves for the
LO	record beginning with the plaintiff.
L1	MS. STINNETT: Ann Marie Stinnett for plaintiff.
L2	THE COURT: Okay. And for defendants?
L3	MS. LEAHY: Tracy Leahy and David Cessante.
L4	THE COURT: Okay. Can you spell both of your names
L5	for Ms. Ward.
L6	MS. LEAHY: We have.
L7	THE COURT: Great. Okay. Who is going to be arguing
L8	for defendants?
L9	MS. LEAHY: I am.
20	THE COURT: Okay. Have a seat for a minute and let
21	me just get everything in order.
22	MS. LEAHY: Good morning, Your Honor. You may recall
23	we were here on December 28th, at which time you struck
24	portions of the plaintiff's complaint, including three exhibits
25	that were attached to the complaint, and you ordered that the

Case 2:10-cv-15043-PDB-LJM ECF No. 54, PageID.560 Filed 05/06/11 Page 4 of 28

Motion to Strike and/or Seal Amended Second Complaint 4 Friday, February 25, 2011

complaint be sealed and you ordered that plaintiff file a reformulated complaint and provide defense counsel with a copy for approval.

We were back here on February 16th, at which time you clarified your ruling, and then you eventually issued a written opinion and order on February 17th.

Your rulings have been very clear. You have indicated that Rule 8 requires a short, plain statement of the grounds for plaintiff's claims, notice pleading is all that is required, and that it is inappropriate to attach matters which could be 404(b) inadmissible. You ruled that it's not necessary to attach evidentiary material to the complaint and it is not appropriate pleading, and you directed plaintiff to file the second complaint and give defense counsel a copy of it and ordered that the original would remain under seal.

In blatant disregard of these rulings, after waiting weeks to file a second complaint, Ms. Stinnett filed an amended second complaint --

THE COURT: Well, first she filed a second complaint --

MS. LEAHY: Minutes later she --

THE COURT: -- on the 22nd.

MS. LEAHY: That's true.

THE COURT: Okay. That complaint is not in any way

25 sealed.

Case 2:10-cv-15043-PDB-LJM ECF No. 54, PageID.561 Filed 05/06/11 Page 5 of 28

MS. LEAHY:

1

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Motion to Strike and/or Seal Amended Second Complaint 5 Friday, February 25, 2011

That is correct.

2 THE COURT: That complaint is open and about? MS. LEAHY: That is correct. 3 THE COURT: As is every hearing that has been held in 4 I see that there is a mistake on the docket sheet which 5 indicates -- we had the hearing December 28th. It was in open 6 7 court and it was not to be sealed so that will be corrected, 8 but every hearing in court has been in an open court. Nothing has been closed. 9 10 So the second complaint was filed on February 28th, and 11 then briefly thereafter also on February 28th a second amended complaint was filed. 12 13 MS. LEAHY: It was actually February 22nd, but that is correct.

THE COURT: Let me just see it.

MS. LEAHY: And that was the date you ordered that it be filed.

> THE COURT: Right, right, right.

So nothing new happened in between the MS. LEAHY: filing of the second complaint and the amended second complaint. In fact, the amended complaint doesn't add any new parties, and it doesn't add any new causes of action or theories of liability.

THE COURT: I think, in counting, are you talking about the second amended complaint?

MS. LEAHY: Yes.

THE COURT: Because I like to do things -- that has ten counts, and the second complaint has eight counts.

MS. LEAHY: What she did is she separated her hostile environment and quid pro quo claims into separate, but they were already pled in the second complaint so it's really not any new cause of action.

So we believe the clear intent of the amended second complaint was to skirt your ruling and your order. She never intended to rely on the second complaint.

THE COURT: Let's talk, rather than she, talk about Ms. Stinnett, okay? Let's use that word, Ms. Stinnett, okay?

MS. LEAHY: Sure, no problem.

Ms. Stinnett did not provide a copy of the amended complaint to defense counsel because she knew we were not going to approve it.

THE COURT: Oh, you mean prefiling?

MS. LEAHY: Exactly. And the reason we were not going to approve it is because it contains the same exact kinds of allegations that the original complaint contained in which we argued should be sealed and stricken and which this Court did in fact seal and strike.

It's very clear to us from the attachments to her response and her attachments as exhibits to the amended second complaint and her references to the IP360 article and Karen Drew that the

Case 2:10-cv-15043-PDB-LJM ECF No. 54, PageID.563 Filed 05/06/11 Page 7 of 28

Motion to Strike and/or Seal Amended Second Complaint 7 Friday, February 25, 2011

motive for the amended second complaint is nothing more than to obtain public disclosure of matters that are unsubstantiated and that may never be admissible in this case. More importantly, it skirts your ruling and ignores your ruling from the bench and your written order.

So our issue with the original complaint and with this amended second complaint is that it goes way beyond the necessity of notice pleading. That's number one.

Many of the allegations -- I counted at least 58 -- are not based on personal knowledge. They are pled upon information and belief, which means that they are hearsay and they may never be admissible in this case. She's getting judgment essentially --

THE COURT: Wait. Ms. Stinnett.

MS. LEAHY: Excuse me, Ms. Stinnett, I apologize.

Ms. Stinnett is essentially getting judgment by pleading of matters that may not ever be admissible in this case. So what we are saying is that this highly questionable, totally possibly inadmissible allegation should not be paraded around for the transparent purpose of public humiliation or personal revenge. This is not a motion to dismiss. We are not, as she alleges, trying to avoid answering any of the allegations. In fact, we look forward to moving forward with this case. We approved the filing of this --

THE COURT: So is Ms. Stinnett.

MS. LEAHY: We approved the second complaint six weeks ago. She's the one who sat on it. Ms. Stinnett is the one who sat on it and did not file it. Our point is that she doesn't need all of these new factual allegations or these exhibits that she's attached to her motion to go forward with her claims.

So we are requesting that you strike Exhibit F and Paragraphs 166 through 174 and 179 through 183. Those relate to --

THE COURT: Say that again. 166 through 174 and 179 to 183.

MS. LEAHY: That's correct.

Exhibit F violates the Court's previous order.

Ms. Stinnett is trying to get in through the back door, which you have already previously ruled she cannot and should be sealed. Exhibit F quotes from the three exhibits that were attached to her original complaint, which you struck as additional evidence that was not appropriate under Rule 8, and Ms. Stinnett has, in her response, which I would like to respond to now, if you'd like --

THE COURT: You can respond after she does if you want or you can do it right now.

MS. LEAHY: All right. She's argued that Exhibit F is already in the public domain. In fact, we do not agree with that. This particular article is available by subscription

Case 2:10-cv-15043-PDB-LJM ECF No. 54, PageID.565 Filed 05/06/11 Page 9 of 28

Motion to Strike and/or Seal Amended Second Complaint 9 Friday, February 25, 2011

only, and it's directed at a very select group of attorneys, those that have -- those that practice intellectual property or trademark law.

But, more importantly, even if it is in the public domain, it refers to those matters that you have already ruled are stricken and should be sealed, and she can go forward with the allegations in her complaint without the necessity of this exhibit being attached.

We are also requesting that you strike Paragraphs 12 through 14, 51 through 63, 69 through 70, and 77. These concern --

THE COURT: 69?

MS. LEAHY: Through 70.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. LEAHY: And 77.

THE COURT: And 77.

MS. LEAHY: Yeah.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. LEAHY: These allegations concern events that occurred in 1994 and in 1995 and/or are otherwise undated but which suggest that they occurred prior to her employment with the firm. Each paragraph, again, is not based on personal knowledge. It's pled based upon information and belief. She has no personal knowledge of these events other than what she may have been told by others. She wasn't even working at the

Case 2:10-cv-15043-PDB-LJM ECF No. 54, PageID.566 Filed 05/06/11 Page 10 of 28

Motion to Strike and/or Seal Amended Second Complaint₁₀ Friday, February 25, 2011

firm when several of these events occurred nine years earlier, and again, she can plead and she can go forward with her claims without this unsubstantiated inadmissible hearsay.

We are also requesting that you strike Paragraphs 17 and 125 through 131. These reference attorney-client communications. There's no allegation in the amended second complaint that the client waived any -- waived the attorney-client privilege, nor is there any allegation in the affidavit, I believe it's Exhibit C -- yes -- that the attorney-client privilege was being waived. Again, as with the others, it's not necessary for her claims. She can proceed without these allegations.

The same thing with respect to Exhibits D and E, and with respect to Paragraphs 149 through 154, 161 through 163, and 175 through 178.

THE COURT: Let me ask a question --

MS. LEAHY: Uh-huh.

THE COURT: -- when you get to exhibits. You are talking about the amended second complaint?

MS. LEAHY: Yes.

THE COURT: Exhibit D is that big ad that I saw, I think, in Crain's?

MS. LEAHY: I believe it was, and if I can clarify as to Exhibit D and this particular matter which is referenced in Exhibit D. This was published at the time of the original

Case 2:10-cv-15043-PDB-LJM ECF No. 54, PageID.567 Filed 05/06/11 Page 11 of 28

Motion to Strike and/or Seal Amended Second Complaint₁₁ Friday, February 25, 2011

judgment. There was no payment at that time or settlement at that time. Settlement -- there was an appeal taken, and there was not a settlement until two years later.

Exhibit E references the time frame of the settlement of that matter, and there was no comment by the firm at that time other than to indicate that there had been a settlement.

Mr. Andilary [sp] is quoted from the second-to-the-last paragraph.

THE COURT: You are talking about Exhibit F?

MS. LEAHY: I'm talking about Exhibit E.

THE COURT: E?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

okay.

MS. LEAHY: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. The second-to-the-last paragraph,

Okay. So you're saying --

MS. LEAHY: So there is -- I'm sorry.

THE COURT: So you are saying take something that you advertised in a newspaper and seal that.

MS. LEAHY: Strike it, and the reason for that is that it is completely unnecessary for the notice pleading aspect of her case. She can go forward without these additional exhibits being attached to the complaint.

THE COURT: Okay, okay. I'll call you back because you are the moving party --

MS. LEAHY: Okay.

THE COURT: -- after Ms. Stinnett.

MS. STINNETT: Your Honor, I would like to address my filing of the amended second complaint first. At the hearing on the 28th I was pretty aware that there was going to be an inevitable 12(b)(6) motion filed. At that point I realized that I needed to amend my complaint to make sure that I have included every possible thing that I could remember, and in doing so, I amended the complaint and I filed --

THE COURT: You stated on Page 8 of the transcript we are thinking of possibly filing somewhere down the road an amended second complaint.

MS. STINNETT: Yes, Your Honor, I did, and we did file that right after we filed the second complaint per your order. And under Rule 15 I have a right to do that because defendants have not been served yet and it is within 21 days of that. So I just did it per leave of court per the federal court rule.

THE COURT: And in doing that did you not violate the Court order of the, I believe it's the 17th of February where it said, "The Court notes that the scandalous matter contained in Exhibits C, D and E of the original complaint and the attendant paragraphs in the complaint itself do not properly belong in the complaint," and then at the bottom of Page 2, going to Page 3, I say, "In the mean time, any pleadings or motions relating to the subject matter in Exhibits C, D and E

must be filed under seal."

As I read the second amended complaint, in Paragraph 52, that deals with C, Exhibit C from the first complaint. As I read Exhibit F, that also deals with some of those matters on the second page of Exhibit F by the amended second complaint. It deals with Exhibit D in the earlier complaint. So those two matters directly violate the Court's Opinion and Order with regard to this matter that was handed down.

MS. STINNETT: Yes, Your Honor. In regards to Paragraph 52, I believe, and I'll have to double-check, that what you ordered not to be struck did have to do with a documented incident in 1994. I was also told this by the particular person. She told other folks as well. So I don't feel that it violated your order at all.

In regards to Exhibit F, the reason why I included that was because that was the first time ever I was notified that the reason for my termination was due to performance. I was never told that earlier, and to me that's a party admission. It goes directly against what they said earlier, that it was due to economic conditions, and that shows pretext, which is important for my claims.

THE COURT: Right, but that also contains material on the second page that the Court had covered in its order with regard to not going there because of its scandalous nature.

MS. STINNETT: If it does, Your Honor, it's maybe

one sentence or two.

THE COURT: You know, there is a possibility of redaction. Certainly I think the part where you claim that originally they said it was a reduction in force --

MS. STINNETT: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: -- then they said it was performance that is relevant and appropriate.

And I might as well use the microphone. Is that why you are looking at me, Ms. Ward? I'm sorry.

Also, the ad that they put in *Crain's* larger than life is out and about, as I mentioned, but there are two aspects to it at this point in the second amended complaint that violates the Court's order. So go ahead, argue further, then we'll --

MS. STINNETT: Okay. And I assume you are talking about Number 52 and the Exhibit F?

THE COURT: It's, yeah, Paragraph 52, which relates to C from the initial complaint and Exhibit F on the second page, which deals with Exhibit D in the initial complaint, both of which were covered by the order.

MS. STINNETT: In regards to Paragraph 52, I do believe, and I will need to double-check, I don't have a copy of the original complaint with me sealed, but I do believe that you let survive that there was a documented incident in 1994, and the reason would be because it shows that the firm had knowledge of a documented incident back in 1994.

Case 2:10-cv-15043-PDB-LJM ECF No. 54, PageID.571 Filed 05/06/11 Page 15 of 28

Motion to Strike and/or Seal Amended Second Complaint₁₅ Friday, February 25, 2011

THE COURT: That was not my ruling. I didn't rule on 1 2 the evidence. MS. STINNETT: I believe, I will have to see, this 3 may have been reworded, but I believe that the 1994 date was 4 5 preserved. I wish I had a copy of it. If you don't mind, 6 Your Honor, could we take a break? I think I do have one in 7 the sealed complaint. I can take a look at it. 8 THE COURT: Yeah, have a seat. 9 MS. STINNETT: Okay. 10 THE COURT: You can sit down and relax. 11 MS. STINNETT: Okay. I am ready to go. On Number 42 of the original complaint, 12 13 it reads, "Upon information and belief, Defendant Brooks Kushman and Ernie Brooks were aware --14 15 **THE COURT:** 42 of the original? 16 MS. STINNETT: Yes. 17 THE COURT: May I get to that? I also have 18 three different copies up here, so let me -- okay. Right. What was ordered out was 43 through "upon the 19 20 information and belief," those were paragraphs which were --21 MS. STINNETT: It was actually left in. It was just 22 that the reference --23 THE COURT: 42 was left in. 24 MS. STINNETT: Well, actually 43 and 44 were left in. 25 It was the reference to Exhibit C that was taken out. I just

couldn't refer to Exhibit C because it no longer existed. 1 2 THE COURT: You have transcript there, you say? MS. STINNETT: Pardon me? 3 4 **THE COURT:** Are you reading transcript? 5 MS. STINNETT: No, this is what you ordered if you look at the second amended complaint. 6 7 THE COURT: Well, I'm looking at my order, the 8 written order. MS. STINNETT: Your written order didn't discuss 9 10 that. It was from your transcript. 11 THE COURT: No, my written order discussed everything 12 because --13 MS. STINNETT: And that's where I had confusion on that. 14 15 THE COURT: That's why I did the written order 16 because at the hearing prior to that at the status conference 17 there was a question, and that's why I dealt with those 18 attached exhibits. 19 MS. STINNETT: The second complaint, Your Honor, if 20 you look at it --21 THE COURT: The second complaint? 22 MS. STINNETT: The second complaint that took into effect the rulings from the Court, it allowed what Dan Bretz 23 and Ms. Leahy approved, without use of a better word, does 24 25 include these allegations in Exhibit C. They have survived.

Case 2:10-cv-15043-PDB-LJM ECF No. 54, PageID.573 Filed 05/06/11 Page 17 of 28

Motion to Strike and/or Seal Amended Second Complaint₁₇ Friday, February 25, 2011

1	THE COURT: Can you give me the paragraph numbers of
2	those?
3	MS. STINNETT: The second complaint?
4	THE COURT: Yeah.
5	MS. STINNETT: I don't even think I have the
6	second complaint. I am not sure.
7	THE COURT: I do, but it's so marked up that it
8	wouldn't help.
9	MS. STINNETT: I believe that they said the same.
10	They are somewhat they have been reformatted in the amended
11	second complaint.
12	THE COURT: What are the numbers?
13	MS. STINNETT: I believe it's Paragraphs 42 through
14	44.
15	THE COURT: Okay, okay, okay.
16	Okay, 42 to 44. Okay, the second complaint. Okay.
17	MS. STINNETT: And I guess just to reiterate,
18	Paragraph 52 of the current amended second complaint, it does
19	refer back to earlier versions of the complaint that allowed
20	the 1994 date and the fact that it was documented to survive.
21	THE COURT: Right. That's in the second the
22	amended second complaint dealing with 52. That's what you're
23	saying.
24	MS. STINNETT: Yes, Your Honor.
25	THE COURT: Okay.

Case 2:10-cv-15043-PDB-LJM ECF No. 54, PageID.574 Filed 05/06/11 Page 18 of 28

Motion to Strike and/or Seal Amended Second Complaint₁₈ Friday, February 25, 2011

1	MS. STINNETT: Should I move on to the next?
2	THE COURT: Yes.
3	MS. STINNETT: I think the second one, I apologize if
4	I didn't hear you correctly, was it Exhibit F that we were
5	talking about?
6	THE COURT: Yes, yes. We were talking about
7	Exhibit F, the second page.
8	MS. STINNETT: Right. I, I guess, articulated
9	earlier the reason for including Exhibit F in my complaint. I
10	am not opposed, if there are sentences that are in here that
11	relate to C, D or E, that that sentence be stricken in
12	accordance with your order. If I might find here where there
13	is one.
14	I think on the second page of Exhibit F, three paragraphs
15	down, the third paragraph, I believe that was in regards to
16	one of the exhibits that were stricken.
17	THE COURT: Okay. We are dealing with the
18	second amended complaint. We are dealing with Exhibit F.
19	MS. STINNETT: Yes, Your Honor.
20	THE COURT: Okay. And we are dealing with which,
21	which paragraph, did you say?
22	MS. STINNETT: I believe it was the third paragraph
23	on the second page.
24	THE COURT: Yeah.
25	MS. STINNETT: I'm just going to read it to make sure

there aren't any other references.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I don't see any, but perhaps Ms. Leahy would want to comment.

I don't see anything further, Your Honor. I don't know if Ms. Leahy wants to speak to --

THE COURT: Well, she has the opportunity since she is the moving party.

MS. STINNETT: Okay. Just continue on then?

THE COURT: Yeah, you can continue on.

MS. STINNETT: Okay. In regards to Exhibit -- well, we have already spoke about Exhibit F.

THE COURT: F being?

MS. STINNETT: Law 360 article.

THE COURT: Right. Well, her, her argument is that because it's a subscription issue it is not generally out in the public domain, I guess is the right term, and that therefore because it does contain that paragraph in particular that that part of it is improper, and you are saying that you will sit down with them and redact it.

MS. STINNETT: I can get rid of the third paragraph on the second page that references Exhibits C, D or E.

THE COURT: And the other part you say was because the shareholder Brooks Kushman then changed the reason for your termination that it is relevant?

MS. STINNETT: Yes, Your Honor. Yes, Your Honor.

Case 2:10-cv-15043-PDB-LJM ECF No. 54, PageID.576 Filed 05/06/11 Page 20 of 28

Motion to Strike and/or Seal Amended Second Complaint 20 Friday, February 25, 2011

And they also claimed to say that they had a zero tolerance harassment policy. I had never heard that before either, and that's another party admission that I would like to use further down the road. I did use it in my second amended complaint.

In regards to Exhibit C, which is a sworn declaration from Mr. Clarke.

THE COURT: Right.

MS. STINNETT: I think they are trying or have alleged that they want this stricken or sealed because it has to do with attorney-client privileged communications, and I find that odd because it's the client that usually exercises the attorney-client privileged communications and I also find it odd because Mr. Clarke signed a --

THE COURT: That's Clarke with an E, Ms. Word.

MS. STINNETT: Yes, C-l-a-r-k-e.

He signed a declaration with the heading and the identifying information for this lawsuit. He was well aware of what he was doing and that I was going to attach it to a pleading. So I don't think that that argument should go forward.

And then in regards to --

THE COURT: You are saying that he wasn't a client indeed in 2009 because he wanted to have you as his lawyer?

MS. STINNETT: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And they told him that you weren't there

Case 2:10-cv-15043-PDB-LJM ECF No. 54, PageID.577 Filed 05/06/11 Page 21 of 28

Motion to Strike and/or Seal Amended Second Complaint₂₁ Friday, February 25, 2011

anymore?

MS. STINNETT: Yes, Your Honor. I feel that is -THE COURT: You are saying there is no
attorney-client privilege because he wasn't a client of the
firm?

MS. STINNETT: At the time, that is true, Your Honor, as well.

And in regards to events that defendants claim happened prior to my arrival at the firm, I think they are pertinent. I was aware when I worked at the firm of some of these things that were occurring, and it did make me very uncomfortable around certain people just knowing what the -- I'm not even sure if it was true, I believed it to be true from the people who told me, but it was enough from what I have seen and from what I have heard, enough to make me want to stay away from certain individuals any possible way I could, and that did have an effect on me at the firm and how I worked at the firm. So I believe that that is very relevant, and I think that that should remain in the case. And I did cite to one of your court opinions where it says --

THE COURT: That's always a good idea.

MS. STINNETT: I thought so, too. But it references offensive conduct need not be directed at the plaintiff. The plaintiff need not be present at the time of the offensive conduct. In fact, she can learn of the conduct secondhand.

THE COURT: And it cites a Sixth Circuit opinion of 1 2 Ladd, L-a-d-d. MS. STINNETT: It does, Your Honor. 3 And I believe I have covered most of their arguments. 4 5 did want to say that I don't believe that I should be 6 sanctioned in any way, having to pay costs or be held in 7 contempt of court, for that not to happen. Thank you, 8 Your Honor. 9 Thank you. THE COURT: Okay. 10 MS. LEAHY: I wanted clarify first that --11 THE COURT: You are talking too fast. I wanted to clarify first that the relief 12 MS. LEAHY: 13 we are requesting is striking of the complaint in its -second amended complaint in its entirety --14 15 THE COURT: Striking or sealing. 16 MS. LEAHY: -- or striking the specific paragraphs I 17 mentioned. The second complaint is sufficient. It sets forth 18 her claims. She can go forward on that. She does not need the additional factual allegations that she has alleged in this 19 amended second complaint and because --20 21 THE COURT: Are you saying that you are not going to 22 file a motion to dismiss the complaint, you are going to rely on summary judgment? 23 24 You are saying there is enough facts alleged in the

second complaint so that it's sufficient for her to move ahead

25

Case 2:10-cv-15043-PDB-LJM ECF No. 54, PageID.579 Filed 05/06/11 Page 23 of 28

Motion to Strike and/or Seal Amended Second Complaint₂₃ Friday, February 25, 2011

on the case into discovery past a motion to dismiss. Is that what you are saying?

MS. LEAHY: I'm not saying that. I am saying that she has pled her claims. I don't know whether we are going to be filing a motion to dismiss. I don't want to concede that she has pled enough of her claims, but at the same time I think that her pleadings are sufficient to go forward.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. LEAHY: With respect to Exhibit F, there are several other matters and paragraphs in that exhibit which you previously ruled were stricken or sealed. The second --

THE COURT: Why don't we pull that up and look at it.

You can look at it. Which page and which paragraph?

MS. LEAHY: The first paragraph of Page 2.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. LEAHY: First of all, it inaccurately states that Ms. Stinnett won the contingency case, and I don't believe she even worked on the case. But notwithstanding that, your prior ruling was that all numbers with respect to that settlement would be redacted and stricken from the original complaint, and this paragraph of the article specifically references specific numbers and amounts of that settlement.

Similarly, with respect to the second paragraph on Page-
THE COURT: Well, it says that the total win amount
was one thirty-three, netting at least fifty.

Case 2:10-cv-15043-PDB-LJM ECF No. 54, PageID.580 Filed 05/06/11 Page 24 of 28

Motion to Strike and/or Seal Amended Second Complaint₂₄ Friday, February 25, 2011

MS. LEAHY: Right, and your previous ruling was that numbers would not be included in the allegations of the paragraph related to that settlement. It is a confidential settlement, and the firm has not spoken about the settlement.

Similarly, with respect to the third paragraph of Exhibit F --

THE COURT: That's going to be out eventually.

MS. LEAHY: Okay, excuse me. That's correct.

Okay. With respect to the fourth paragraph, again, the confidential resolution of other matters you clearly struck from the prior complaint, and this article references those in Paragraph 7.

THE COURT: Are you talking about C, D and E of the original one which dealt with EEOC complaints?

MS. LEAHY: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. LEAHY: I don't want to limit ourselves. This doesn't need to be attached as a pleading. It contains some inaccurate information, number one. Number two, it's not necessary to plead the allegations with respect to her pretext argument. She can simply allege, and did allege, in her second complaint that the reasons offered were pretextual because she was never told allegedly that it was performance reasons. So she doesn't need this to be attached to the complaint at all to make those allegations.

Case 2:10-cv-15043-PDB-LJM ECF No. 54, PageID.581 Filed 05/06/11 Page 25 of 28

Motion to Strike and/or Seal Amended Second Complaint₂₅ Friday, February 25, 2011

THE COURT: When you say she doesn't need it, I quess 1 2 from the Court's point of view I don't tell a party what they I tell them what the law permits or doesn't permit. 3 So --4 5 MS. LEAHY: You have already ruled that it's Rule 8 6 notice pleading and that it's inappropriate to attach exhibits 7 to the complaint, and that's exactly what she did with 8 respect -- that Ms. Stinnett did with respect to this particular exhibit and the other three that she attached. 9 10 THE COURT: Exhibit F. Well, when you say the Clarke 11 affidavit, have you got a problem with that in the --I'm getting to that right now. 12 MS. LEAHY: Yes. 13 First of all, nowhere in this affidavit and nowhere in this 14 complaint does Mr. Clarke -- is it alleged that Mr. Clarke is 15 waiving the attorney-client privilege, and there are specific references in Paragraph 6 and 7 to events that occurred while 16 17 that case was pending. 18 THE COURT: Oh, with regard to the settlement matters in the initial representation? 19 20 MS. LEAHY: Right, exactly. 21 THE COURT: Okay. So does attorney-client apply 22 there. 23 Right, and I think the real purpose of MS. LEAHY: 24 this affidavit was to suggest that Ms. Stinnett was performing 25 to what she believed to be up to expectations, and that's

really the only purpose of this, as I can see it.

With respect to the other acts of alleged harassment or the other conduct that she's complaining of, while it's true that she does not have to witness that conduct, she does need to be aware of it and she does need to be aware of it at the time of her employment. And the Hawkins v. Anheuser Bush case clearly indicates that. It's not sufficient that she learn about it at sometime after her employment, and the allegations, many of the allegations in her complaint don't reference when she learned about this conduct, the ones that she actually alleges that she was aware of. Many of the allegations she never even alleges that she was aware of, and they are just pled upon information and belief. So we have no way of knowing that she actually did know about many of them.

And I think that responds to the issues.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

The Court has before it right now the issue of sealing the second amended complaint. With regard to Exhibit F, the plaintiff admits that that part, the third paragraph at least, does violate the Court's order and opinion on February 17th, 2010. What I'm going to do is seal the second amended complaint now. I'm going to get a copy of the transcript, we'll go over everything, and then issue an order. In the mean time, to the extent that the parties want to work on it, they can, but I'm not ordering them to. I'm going to look at the

Case 2:10-cv-15043-PDB-LJM ECF No. 54, PageID.583 Filed 05/06/11 Page 27 of 28

Motion to Strike and/or Seal Amended Second Complaint₂₇ Friday, February 25, 2011

items that were alleged. I am not going to suppress clearly Exhibit D, and when I say not, in my ultimate order.

But right here we are going to seal the complaint. We have a second complaint out and about in the public domain, and I will work on issuing an Opinion and Order with regard to plaintiff's claims and the defendant's responses and the defendant's motion as to whether this is a violation of Rule 8 or Rule 12.

In the mean time you can meet and proceed further on discovery and matters like that because there is a viable complaint, and let's move ahead. Okay? Have a good weekend.

MS. STINNETT: Thank you, Your Honor.

MS. LEAHY: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

(Proceedings concluded at 11:54 a.m.)

CERTIFICATION

I, Sheri K. Ward, official court reporter for the United States District Court, Eastern District of Michigan, Southern Division, appointed pursuant to the provisions of Title 28, United States Code, Section 753, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript of the proceedings in the above-entitled cause on the date hereinbefore set forth.

Case	2:10-cv-15043-PDB-LJM ECF No. 54, PageID.584 Filed 05/06/11 Page 28 of 28
	Motion to Strike and/or Seal Amended Second Complaint Friday, February 25, 2011
1	I do further certify that the foregoing
2	transcript has been prepared by me or under my direction.
3	
4	s/ Sheri K. Ward May 4, 2011
5	Sheri K. Ward Official Court Reporter
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
	10-15043; Stinnett v. Brooks Kushman, Cantor